



Report to the Plan Commission

July 25, 2011

Legistar I.D. #22848
229 West Lakelawn Place
Rezoning

Report Prepared By:
Heather Stouder, AICP
Planning Division Staff

Requested Action: Approval of the rezoning of property from R6 (General Residence) District to PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan) to construct a five-story building with 14 residential units.

Applicable Regulations & Standards: Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments. Section 28.07 (6) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Development Districts.

Summary Recommendation: The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that the standards for zoning map amendments and planned unit developments can be met and forward the request to the August 2 meeting of the Common Council with a recommendation for **approval** to rezone 229 West Lakelawn Place from R6 to PUD-SIP, subject to input at the public hearing and conditions from reviewing agencies.

Background Information

Applicant/Project Contact: Josh Wilcox; Gary Brink and Associates, Inc.; 8401 Excelsior Dr.; Madison

Property Owner: Palladia, LLC; 615 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 214; Madison

Proposal: The applicant proposes a new 14-unit multifamily apartment building behind the adjacent Acacia apartment/fraternity building, for a total of 21 units and 9 lodging rooms on the site. The applicant hopes complete the building for August 2012 occupancy.

Parcel Location: 229 West Lakelawn Place is located just north of Langdon Street on the southwest corner of Lakelawn Place and West Lakelawn Place; Aldermanic District 2 (Maniaci); Madison Metropolitan School District.

Existing Conditions: The site is currently developed with the four-story Acacia fraternity house, with a gravel parking lot in the area where the new building is proposed, zoned R6 (General Residence District).

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North: Multifamily apartments and lodging houses zoned R6 (General Residence District).

South: Beyond the adjacent Acacia building, directly across Langdon Street at 221 Langdon Street, a fraternity house with 22 apartment units zoned PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan). Other buildings on the south side of Langdon Street include multifamily apartments and lodging houses zoned R6 (General Residence District).

East: TKE fraternity house (216 Langdon Street) zoned R6 (General Residence District).

West: Mixed-use building with 26 apartment units and MacTaggart's Market, a small convenience store, (228 Langdon Street) zoned R6 (General Residence District).

Adopted Land Use Plans: The Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as the Langdon Downtown Residential Subdistrict, where recommended land uses include but are not limited to mixed-use buildings and multi-unit residential buildings with 16-60 units per acre. The Downtown Plan (in progress) is likely to retain a five-story height limit, as is currently the limit for residential PUDs in Downtown Design Zone 4.

Environmental Corridor Status: This property is not located within a mapped environmental corridor.

Public Utilities and Services: The area is served by a full range of urban services.

Zoning Summary:

Bulk Requirements	Required*	Proposed
Lot Area	6000 sq. ft.	13,780 sq. ft.
Lot width	50'	56.33'
Usable Open Space	70 sq. ft. / bedroom = 6,300 sq. ft.	As shown on plans
Front yard	25' min. from Langdon St.	40' from Langdon St.
Side yards	8' and 6' min. (DDZ4)	8' (W Lakelawn Pl.) 6' (east side)
Rear yard	20' min.	20'
Floor area ratio	2.0 max. (R6) 3.0 max. (DDZ4)	2.43
Building height	5 stories (DDZ4)	50' ±

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	0	0
Bike Parking	24 (21 for apts, 3 for lodging rooms)	12 (plus 52 stacked) <i>(Please see Condition No. 8, Page 14)</i>
Moped Parking	0	20
Accessible stalls	0	0
Loading	1 10' x 35' loading stall	2 loading stalls (8' x 16' and 9' x 18') <i>(Please see Condition No. 10, Page 14)</i>
Landscaping	Yes	Yes
Lighting	Yes	Yes <i>(Please see Condition No. 9, Page 14)</i>

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes
Historic District	Yes (Langdon Street National Historic District)
Landmark Building	No
Adjacent to Landmark	No
Floodplain	No
Utility Easements	None shown
Adjacent to park	No
Barrier Free (ILHR 69)	No

*Since this project is being rezoned to the (PUD-GDP & SIP) district, and there are no predetermined bulk requirements, we are reviewing it based on the criteria for the R6 district and DDZ4 requirements.

Compiled by Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator

Related Actions

On June 22, 2011, the Urban Design Commission voted unanimously to grant *initial approval* for the design of the proposal with recommendations to consider minor changes to materials, landscaping, and site details (see attached report). On July 20, 2011, the Urban Design Commission granted *final approval* for the design. If available, staff will include the report from this meeting in the back of the Plan Commission packet.

On May 23 and June 27, 2011, the Landmarks Commission received informational presentations by the applicant and commented on issues related to its compatibility with other structures in the Langdon

Street National Historic District. No action was taken at these meetings, but the evolution of the project design and architectural detail was much appreciated by the Landmarks Commission, as evidenced in the attached reports.

Note: While not directly related to this proposal, it is important to note that this is not the first proposal for a five-story multi-family building on this particular site. On January 26, 2009 the Plan Commission failed to recommend approval for the proposal by a vote of 4 to 4. On February 3, 2009, the Common Council voted to place on file a proposal by a different applicant which had very similar massing to the current proposal. This occurred after a motion to approve the proposal failed on a 10 to 9 vote (see Legislative ID# 12473). Issues discussed by the Plan commission and Council focused on whether the Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones could be met. In the Evaluation section beginning on p. 5, staff has included these criteria in their entirety, along with a brief evaluation of each.

Project Description

The subject site is 229 West Lakelawn Place, located on the east side of West Lakelawn Place between East Lakelawn Place and Langdon Street in R6 General Residence district zoning. The applicant is requesting approval for a rezoning from R6 to PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development - Specific Implementation Plan) for two multifamily buildings with a total of 21 dwelling units and 9 lodging rooms and an expected occupancy of 90 residents (see table below). If one counts a lodging room as a dwelling unit, the residential density proposed for the property is 97 units per acre and 290 bedrooms per acre.

Floor	New Building			Existing Building				
	3BR	4BR	6BR	Single Lodging	Double Lodging	1BR	2BR	3BR
Basement	1							
1		1		4	2	1		
2	1	1	1		3			
3	1	1	1					2
4	1	1	1				2	
5	1	1	1					2
Total Units	14 (5 x 3BR, 5 x 4BR, 4 x 6BR)			7 + 9 Lodging (1x1BR, 2x2BR, 4x3BR 4 Singles, 5 Doubles)				
Total Residents	59			31				

A new 14-unit apartment building is proposed behind the existing Acacia fraternity house, which was reconfigured in 2010 into a building with seven apartments and nine lodging rooms. The applicant hopes to initiate construction when all necessary approvals are obtained and complete by August 2012.

Existing Conditions

The 13,776 square foot (0.31-acre) property is currently developed with the Acacia fraternity house, which is oriented toward Langdon Street and would remain on the site. Originally built in 1927 as the Phi Mu Sorority, the building was designed by noted local architects Law, Law and Potter and is listed as a contributing building in the Langdon Street National Historic District. The building was recently converted from a lodging house to a multifamily residential building with seven apartments and nine lodging rooms. A gravel parking lot accessed from Lakelawn Place behind the building accommodates approximately 25-30 cars with an informal stacked parking arrangement. The proposed development would replace the gravel parking lot.

Description of Proposal

Building Bulk and Placement- The proposed new building is a five-story, flat-roofed, rectangular building with a basement level emerging four to five feet from the existing grade on the north side of the building. The building is 99 feet long, 42 feet wide, and approximately 50 feet tall at its highest point.

The building exactly meets the setback requirements for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zone 4, with an 8 foot side yard setback along West Lakelawn Place to the west, a 6 foot side yard setback from the eastern property line, and a 20 foot setback from the rear property line to the north (the existing front yard on Langdon Street will remain the front yard for the property as a whole).

Residential Unit Type and Mix- As proposed, the building includes five 3-bedroom units, five 4-bedroom units, and four 6-bedroom units, all generally intended to serve the student market. Units range from approximately 850-1600 square feet, with an average of 264 square feet of livable space per occupant. Each unit has at least one bathroom for every two occupants, and the 6-bedroom units each have two refrigerators in the kitchen. Interior common spaces for all tenants include a small exercise room, laundry facilities, a small lounge, and the lobby on the first floor of the building.

Parking and Access- No long-term automobile parking is proposed for the site, although two small loading zones are proposed on the north and west sides of the property. An at-grade parking area for 20 mopeds and 7 bicycles is proposed on the southern end of the building, underneath the second floor of the building. This area is open to the air and can be accessed by bicyclists, pedestrians, and moped users from West Lakelawn Place between the two buildings. Stacked parking spaces for 52 additional bicycles is located in the basement level, and can be accessed via a stairwell from the at-grade parking area, which includes narrow ramps to ease bicycle transport. Five existing outdoor bicycle stalls on the northeast corner of the Acacia building would remain for use by tenants and visitors). The parking areas, with a total of 20 moped stalls and 64 bicycle stalls, are intended to serve the expected 90 tenants of both buildings.

Entries and Openings- The main entrance to the building is close to the center of the eastern facade along Lakelawn Place, and leads to a vestibule and central lobby area. Although not visible from the exterior of the building, secondary entrances lead to the lobby and basement bicycle parking area through the at-grade parking area on the south side of the building. Overall, the building has a high proportion of window openings, with a "storefront" style facade on the first level facing Lakelawn Place, windows at regular intervals on all levels, and long spans of glass on all sides of the fifth story.

Exterior Materials- Like most buildings in the area, the building has a masonry exterior with approximately equal proportions of brick and concrete masonry units and accents of metal and EIFS. On the south half of the western facade of the building, the brick color and size closely matches that of the adjacent Acacia building. Storefront style glass is proposed along the entire ground floor facing Lakelawn Place, and for large proportions of the uppermost level.

Usable Open Space- Most of the usable open space on the site is structured, with shared patios on the north and west sides of the building and small balconies for all above-ground units, which range from 40 to 45 square feet in size and have a minimum depth of 5 feet. Including the private balconies and shared patios, there is approximately 800 square feet of usable open space associated with the proposed building for an average of roughly 60 square feet per unit. The rest of the open space on the site is heavily landscaped.

Landscaping and Stormwater Management- The landscape plan includes three small deciduous trees, shrubs, and low perennials on the north side of the building surrounding the proposed patio. A fourth small deciduous tree is proposed between the two buildings, and the balance of the site contains foundation plantings of shrubs, small evergreens, and low perennials. Stormwater impacts from the proposal will be minimal, as the existing condition is a gravel parking unsuitable for significant infiltration.

The applicant proposes the use of permeable pavers for both loading zones, and these, along with the landscaped areas, should minimally reduce the amount of runoff that would otherwise occur.

Public Input

Prior to submitting application materials, the applicant and alder held a neighborhood meeting on May 5, 2011 which was attended by approximately 20 people who provided generally positive feedback on the redevelopment concept. The residents of the TKE fraternity house immediately east of the site have expressed concerns about the height of the proposed building, noting that it would partially block the views of Lake Mendota from their rooftop (see attached letter and photos). No other public input on the proposal has been received at this time.

Evaluation

Land Use

The proposed land use is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which recommends multifamily residential and mixed-use buildings at densities up to 60 units per acre or greater. Consistent with the height limit in Downtown Design Zone 4, the draft recommendations in the Downtown Plan maintain a five-story height limit in this area, which indirectly limits residential densities.

The residential density of the proposal is quite high at 97 units per acre and 290 bedrooms per acre. However, the design of the building and site should accommodate the density well. The shared bicycle and moped parking area, site amenities (exercise room, lounge, interior trash management, and structured open spaces provide for the 90 expected tenants in the two buildings on the property, and a lack of automobile parking should actually reduce negative impacts of density, so long as all tenants are made aware that there are no parking opportunities in the immediate area.

On balance, staff believes that the replacement of an unorganized gravel parking lot with a new high-quality multifamily apartment building for the student market is a positive addition to the already dense Langdon Street area so close to the UW Campus and downtown. In the following section, staff will evaluate the physical and operational aspects of the proposal against the design criteria for downtown design zones, which are included in their entirety as *italicized text* for reference. A brief staff evaluation follows each criterion.

Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for PUD Districts in Downtown Design Zones-

Statement of Purpose

The Design Criteria serve to articulate community design principles, guidelines, and standards for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) in the near-campus Design Zones with the goal of enhancing the community's overall value and appearance. These criteria reflect the fact that the general development density and intensity of occupancy are expected to be relatively high in these Design Zones compared to other locations in the City. PUDs that have residential components may be considered which are significantly larger, taller, and more massive than would be allowed in the underlying zoning districts. Because it is recognized that design professionals, including architects, landscape architects, and land planners, are trained to strive for creative excellence, the design criteria are not intended to restrict creative solutions or to dictate design.

These criteria will serve as a tool for City staff, the UDC, and the Plan Commission by providing a checklist of the primary elements to be considered when reviewing such PUD requests. This will also inform the design professionals of items that should be considered from the beginning of the design process. These standards will be used in addition to the standards in the zoning code which guide the review of PUD requests. The requirements described in Section 28.07(6)(e) are intended to be the outer limits of what will

be considered through this PUD process. The review process for the overall design of the proposed building shall consider the requirements in Section 28.07(6)(e), the Criteria for Approval in Section 28.07(6)(f), and the design criteria described herein.

Exterior Building Design

Exterior design criteria were developed to ensure that such buildings are compatible on a City, neighborhood, and block level; have a pedestrian orientation; and have a design that reflects the residential use of the structure. The following criteria are guidelines for evaluating design of the proposed project.

1) Massing. The proportions and relationships of the various architectural components of the building should be utilized to ensure compatibility with the scale of other buildings in the vicinity. Appropriate transitions should be provided where a change in scale is needed to ensure this compatibility. Larger buildings should have their mass broken up to avoid being out of scale with their surroundings and to provide a more pedestrian-friendly quality. Stepping back the upper floors of the street facades a substantial distance from lower floors may be appropriate to achieve this quality. The shape of the building should not detract from or dominate the surrounding area.

The proposed building is slightly out of scale with surrounding buildings, which are 3-5 stories tall with hipped and gabled roofs. The building placement and height do meet the requirements of Downtown Design Zone 4, but a critical challenge has been the need to effectively break up the 99 foot long wall formed by the building along West Lakelawn Place, which is a very narrow street. While the applicant has not utilized substantial stepbacks of upper levels, the articulation of the roofline and changes in exterior materials do visually break up the mass of the building. The vertical glass element bisecting the western facade of the building is particularly effective. The applicant should ensure that changes in building materials are generally accompanied by a change in plane, specifically on the eastern facade, where this is not the case with the latest version of the proposal.

2) Orientation. Buildings create and define the public space (streets and sidewalks) and how the building faces this public way is important. Any building facade adjacent to a street should be oriented toward and engage the street. Buildings should respect the orientation of surrounding buildings, existing pedestrian paths and sidewalks, and the orientation of surrounding streets.

Staff believes that this criterion can be met. The building is well oriented to West Lakelawn Place, with the main entrance, a pedestrian boardwalk, and a narrow patio located on the west side of the building. The Lakelawn Place frontage (north facade) currently functions as the rear of the building, with no pedestrian linkage from the street to the building. Considering that the Downtown Plan (in progress) will likely recommend this stretch of Lakelawn Place as a portion of a pedestrian route paralleling Lake Mendota, staff recommends that a direct pedestrian linkage be incorporated to the northern patio. This linkage would be recommended regardless of the recommendation in the Downtown Plan, as it would also greatly improve the functionality of the proposed short term parking space on this side of the building, which currently has no connection to the building entrance.

3) Building Components. The building should have an identifiable base, body, and cap. The design and detailing of the base are critical to defining the public space, engaging the street, and creating an interesting pedestrian environment. Lower levels should be sufficiently detailed to ground the building. The top of the building should be clearly defined through treatments such as cornices or non-flat roof elements where appropriate. The middle of the building should provide a transition between the top and the base. Mechanical equipment (including rooftop) should be architecturally screened.

Staff believes that this criterion is addressed. The majority of the building has a concrete masonry unit (CMU) base, a brick and CMU body, and a cap defined with long spans of windows on the upper level, as well as a parapet slightly varied in height on different components of the building. Mechanical equipment is well-screened on the roof, and the at-grade moped and

bicycle parking area is screened with a “green wall”. While staff supports the innovative use of plants as an architectural element, an alternative such as wooden louvers would also be supported, especially if the plantings are ineffective as screens in the Wisconsin climate.

4) Articulation. Well-articulated buildings add architectural interest and variety to the massing of a building and help break up long, monotonous facades. A variety of elements should be incorporated into the design of the building to provide sufficient articulation of the facades. This may be achieved by having a variety in the mix of unit size and layout, or changes in floor levels, be reflected in the exterior of the building. This may also be achieved by incorporating the use of: vertical and/or horizontal reveals, stepbacks, modulation, projections, and three dimensional detail between surface planes to create shadow lines and break up flat surface areas. If large blank surfaces are proposed, they should be for some compelling design purpose, and the design should incorporate mitigating features to enrich the appearance of the project and provide a sense of human scale at the ground level that is inviting to the public.

Staff believes that this criterion can be met. The west facade is the most visible, and is effectively articulated through the use of glass and changes in materials. The building is well articulated on the north and south facades as well, through changes in materials and the placement of balconies, which emerge approximately 4 feet from the building. As mentioned in the “Massing” section above, the eastern facade of the building should incorporate a change in plane congruous with the change in exterior materials for a more effective result.

5) Openings. The size and rhythm of openings (windows, doors, etc.) in a building should respect those established by existing buildings in the area and the residential and/or mixed-use nature of the building. The street facade should incorporate a sufficient number of windows, doors, balconies, and other opportunities for occupant surveillance of public areas. Visibility should be provided to areas accessed when entering or exiting a building. Lower floor facades should be more transparent and open than upper floors to provide a more detailed and human scaled architectural expression along the sidewalk. Window glass should have a high degree of transparency and should not be dark or reflective. Garage doors should not be visible from the street. If a design is proposed in which garage doors (or other service openings) are visible from the street, they should be sufficiently detailed and integrated into the building.

Staff believes that this criterion is well-addressed. The building has a very high proportion of openings for a fully residential building, while respecting the adjacent Acacia building and other existing buildings close by. Long spans of windows on the fifth story and the partially inset balconies effectively break up the mass of the building, and the storefront design of the first floor of the west facade provides visibility in and out of the common areas. Finally, the opening to the interior trash enclosure is well hidden from view within the at-grade parking area on the south side of the building.

6) Materials. A variety of materials should be utilized to provide visual interest to the building. Colors and materials should be selected for compatibility with the site and the neighboring area. All sides of a structure should exhibit design continuity and be finished with quality materials. Materials should be those typically found in urban settings. Durable, low-maintenance materials should be used—particularly on surfaces close to the street.

Staff believes that this criterion can be met. The mix of brick, concrete masonry, and glass proposed is more contemporary than, yet still compatible with surrounding buildings. While the use of climbing plants as an exterior “green wall” on the lower level surrounding the parking area is certainly innovative, staff is concerned about how this area might look during winters, and how the plantings will be maintained over time in this area. The applicant has proposed wooden louvers as an alternative material in this location, which staff would support. If the “green wall” is approved in this location, staff recommends that the applicant include more information on how it will be maintained over time, and how it will appear during winter months.

7) Entry Treatment. Buildings with obvious entrances contribute to the definition of the public way and promote a strong pedestrian feel along the street. The building should have at least one clearly-defined

primary entrance oriented towards the street. Entrances should be sized and articulated in proportion to the scale of the building. This may be achieved through the utilization of architectural elements such as: lintels, pediments, pilasters, columns, porticoes, porches, overhangs, railings, balustrades, and others, where appropriate. Any such element utilized should be architecturally compatible with the style, materials, colors, and details of the building as a whole, as shall the doors.

Staff believes that this criterion is met with the placement of the main entrance on the west facade as part of a “storefront” panel of windows. Final plans shall include details on the metal accent material proposed at this location.

8) *Terminal Views and Highly-Visible Corners.* The design of buildings occupying sites located at the end of a street, on a highly-visible corner, or in other prominent view sheds should reflect the prominence of the site. Particular attention should be paid to views from these perspectives and the structures should be treated as focal points by demonstrating a higher degree of architectural embellishments, such as corner towers, to emphasize their location.

Staff believes that this criterion is met.

Site Design / Function

1) *Semi-Public Spaces.* The space between the front facade of the building and the public sidewalk is an important transition area. It can vary in size, but should be thoughtfully considered with a variety of textures in ground treatment—particularly the area around the entryway. The emphasis should be on an urban landscape, incorporating elements such as raised planters, which could also be used as seating, street furniture, lighting, and landscape materials. These features should be architecturally compatible with the styles, materials and colors of the principal building on the lot and those in the immediate area.

Staff believes that this criterion is very well addressed with the proposed pedestrian boardwalk linking the main entrance to two outdoor seating areas on the west and north sides of the building.

2) *Landscaping.* Landscaping should be integrated with other functional and ornamental site and building design elements, and should reinforce the overall character of the area. Landscaping can be effective in reducing the massiveness of a building and in creating a more inviting pedestrian environment. Landscaping should be provided in the front where the building meets the ground as appropriate in the context (maybe trees or planters depending on the setbacks, shape and size of the building) to anchor building to the ground and soften the edge. Plants should be selected based on their compatibility with site and construction features. Ease of maintenance should also be considered.

Staff believes that the proposed landscaping adequately addresses this criterion.

3) *Lighting.* Exterior lighting should be designed to coordinate with the building architecture and landscaping. Building-mounted fixtures should be compatible with the building facades. Exterior lighting levels should not be excessive and should provide even light distribution. Areas around the entryways should be lit sufficiently. Overall lighting levels should be consistent with the character and intensity of existing lighting in the area surrounding the project site.

Staff believes that the proposed lighting adequately addresses this criterion. The applicant has proposed a series of pedestrian scale lights along the western facade of the building, which will replace the need for public lighting in the right-of-way, based on a review by City Engineering staff.

Interior Building Design

The criteria for determining the acceptability of a residential planned unit development within the Downtown Design Zones recognize the particular importance of building layout, functionality, interior design, and general level of amenity in ensuring that the living environment provided will be attractive,

desirable and practical in an area where the intensity of development is relatively high, many potential development sites are relatively constrained in size and limited in configuration, and opportunities for on-site features and amenities outside the building envelope may be necessarily limited. Relevant factors for consideration include:

1) Mix of Dwelling Unit Types. A variety of dwelling unit types, as defined by the number of bedrooms per unit, should be available within the project. There should not be an over-concentration of either very small (efficiency and one bedroom) or very large (four or more bedrooms) units so as to maintain residential choice and provide flexibility for shifts in housing market demand.

The proposed new building has a high proportion of large dwelling units, although when assessing the site as a whole, the three 2-bedroom units, one 1-bedroom unit, and nine lodging rooms in the existing Acacia building provide for a wide variety. Further variety is provided by the presence or absence of outdoor balconies (new building), and the unit sizes, layouts, and number of bathrooms (existing building).

2) Dwelling Unit Size, Type and Layout. The size and layout of each dwelling unit shall be adequate to allow for reasonably efficient placement of furniture to serve the needs of the occupants and create reasonable circulation patterns within the unit.

a) The sizes of bedrooms within the dwelling units should be designed to discourage multiple occupancy of bedrooms when that would result in more than five unrelated individuals living in a unit (the maximum occupancy allowed in the R5 General Residence District). The bedroom sizes should not be large enough to encourage multiple occupancy in units with three or more bedrooms. To the extent compatible with this consideration, having at least one bedroom in each unit sufficiently large for double occupancy makes the unit more suitable for households that include a couple.

b) The size and design of the living room within each unit shall reflect and be adequate for the intended number of occupants of the unit. It is generally expected that the living area be capable of comfortably seating at least the number of residents expected to occupy the unit; however, appropriate size shall be determined as part of the overall project review.

Staff believes that this criterion can be met. Bedrooms and living spaces as proposed in the new building are small, with most bedrooms sized at approximately 90-100 square feet, and an average of 264 square feet of interior space per occupant. (This compares to 310 square feet of interior space for each apartment occupant in the existing Acacia building, and 380 square feet of interior space per occupant in the Sigma Chi building directly across Langdon Street). The small bedroom size certainly discourages multiple-occupancy, but of concern to staff is that there are no closets proposed within the bedrooms. If closets are not proposed in final plans submitted, staff recommends that wardrobes be required to be included among the bedroom furnishings, since the annual move-in and move-out of this type of furniture piece would be extremely difficult.

With regard to common areas within the units, staff believes that sufficient space is provided for seating, as well as storage of food and other items. Further, the incorporation of balconies and common patios will expand the livable area for several months of the year.

When compared to the 2009 proposal at the same location, this proposal omits the central corridor on each level, resulting in a more efficient layout which maximizes the number of bedrooms, while providing adequate interior common spaces and unit size.

3) Interior Entryway. The interior entryway should create an inviting appearance and, when feasible, should include a lobby or similar area where visitors or persons making deliveries can wait. The entryway should be sufficiently transparent to see into or out of the building when entering or leaving.

Staff believes that this criterion is met. The interior vestibule and lobby are visible from the street through a span of storefront windows on the first floor of the western facade. Together, they are

approximately 300 square feet, plenty of space for visitors or tenants awaiting pickups or deliveries.

4) Usable Open Space. Project designs should provide attractive, safe and creatively designed yards, courtyards, plazas, sitting areas or other similar open spaces for building residents. Usable open space on balconies or roof decks may be provided as long as they are sufficiently large (a suggested minimum size for a balcony is 4 feet by 8 feet) and are provided or accessible to all residents. Usable open space on roof decks at lower elevations is preferred to rooftops. At some locations, side and rear yards sufficient to provide usable open space may be limited, and outdoor open space may not represent the most beneficial use of a limited site when the overall density of development is relatively high. Common recreational facilities and social activity spaces in the development may be considered toward meeting the need for usable open space.

Staff believes that on this small lot, the structured open space provided addresses this criterion very well, noting the proposed mix of private balconies for nearly all units, shared patios, and indoor amenities such as the exercise room, lobby, and lounge.

5) Trash Storage. The trash storage area for the building should be located where it is reasonable accessible to the residents, as well as to disposal pick-up crews. In general, it is recommended that the trash storage area be located within the building footprint. Trash storage areas shall not be located in building front yards. Trash storage areas at any location shall be adequately screened to preserve an attractive appearance from the buildings on the site, from adjacent buildings and uses, and from public streets and walkways.

Staff believes that this criterion can be met. The location of the trash storage inside the building is ideal, and access to it should be relatively easy through the bicycle and moped parking area on the south side of the building. For residents, the disposal of trash is relatively easy through the proposed trash chutes on each floor, although it would be optimal if residents were able to recycle using chutes in the same location.

6) Off Street Loading. Adequate off-street loading areas shall be provided, as specified in Section 28.11. The Plan Commission may consider arrangements to provide off-street loading and access from adjoining properties to satisfy the requirement provided that continued use of these arrangements is assured. For all residential developments where the off-street loading area is not adequate to accommodate the anticipated needs of residents moving into or out of the dwelling units, and in particular when significant numbers of residents are expected to want to make these moves within the same limited time period (as with student-oriented housing), a specific resident move-in plan shall also be submitted with the application for a residential development in a Downtown Design Zone describing in detail how the moving needs of residents will be accommodated without creating congestion or traffic problems on public streets or unauthorized use of parking and loading areas that are not part of the development.

The two spaces available for off street loading should adequately address this criterion, especially as it relates to deliveries and the need for short term vehicle parking. These spaces are insufficient for most trucks, but since units are proposed to be furnished, the need for trucks at move-in, move-out times is minimized. A move-in, move-out plan should be submitted within the management plan for review and approval by staff.

7) Resident Parking.

a) Vehicles. The adequacy of provisions for the off-street parking of residents' motor vehicles shall be evaluated as part of the review of the specific development plan. The Plan Commission may consider the likelihood that the types of residents expected will need or desire to keep private motor vehicles, the particular constraints of the development site and the resulting trade-off between the amount of parking provided and other potential site or building amenities, as well as alternate arrangements provided to accommodate the parking needs of residents, such as, provision of leased parking spaces at another location. Inadequate on-site parking may result in restrictions on residential eligibility to obtain Residential Street Parking Permits. Underground parking is preferred to surface parking lots.

b) Bicycles. Adequate on-site bicycle parking shall be provided to meet the needs of all the residents and users of the developments, as provided by Section 28.11(3)(e). Bicycle parking may be shared or assigned to individual dwelling units and should be located where it is reasonably convenient to the residents and to the public street system. It is recommended that at least some bicycle parking should be provided inside the building or in another location protected from the weather. If it is intended or anticipated that residents will store bicycles within individual dwelling units, the design of the units shall include provision for this storage, and hallways, elevators, and other building features shall be appropriately designed to facilitate the transport of bicycles to and from the units.

c) Mopeds. Adequate parking for mopeds should be provided to meet the needs of the residents. Indoor parking spaces should be provided within the parking area provided for other motor vehicles. Outdoor parking for mopeds may be provided within the parking area provided for other motor vehicles or within bicycle parking areas. Mopeds shall not be kept inside the building except within designated moped or motor vehicle parking areas.

Staff believes that this criterion can be met. A lack of automobile parking for tenants at this location should be manageable, as the building is intended for the student market. Even if household types are more varied in the future, the proximity of the site to downtown and transit options makes it an appropriate site for no automobile parking.

The moped and bicycle parking areas proposed in the basement and at-grade are meant to serve the tenants of both buildings. However, even with the stacked bicycle parking arrangement proposed in the basement, the parking provided falls just short of a 1:1 ratio of stalls per tenant. Staff recommends that adjustments are made so that sufficient bicycle and moped parking stalls be provided to maintain a one stall per tenant ratio is maintained.

8) Building Security and Management. Building security and adequate resident access to building management shall be provided as necessary to ensure the safety of residents and to protect them from excessive noise and other nuisances that might be created in and around the premises. Depending upon the size of the building, intensity of occupancy, and type of residents anticipated, adequate security might also require on-site management. A management plan shall be submitted with each application for a residential development in a Downtown Design Zone describing in detail how the necessary security and access to management will be provided. The Plan Commission shall retain continuing jurisdiction over the management plan, and in the event that security problems occur in the future, the Plan Commission may review the management plan and may require that additional actions be taken by the building owner to address specific problems or deficiencies determined to exist.

A draft management plan provided to staff on July 18 notes that security for the new building will rely on a keyless card system, and that a resident manager will be on site for issues that can be addressed without a call to the property manager. The management plan also includes expectations for maintenance, move-in days, and basic rules for tenants regarding the use of balconies and common areas.

Staff believes that the management plan is generally adequate, but recommends that it be revised to include the following:

- Contact information for the property manager, as well as companies used for private trash, recycling, and snow removal.
- More detail on trash and recycling management for both buildings
- The expanded use of the underground bicycle parking area for tenants in both buildings. (Alternatively, if the underground parking area is not intended for use by tenants in both buildings, additional bicycle parking should be incorporated in areas of the site accessible to tenants in the existing Acacia building so that bicycle stalls are available at a ratio of one stall per bedroom).

Criteria for Approval of Planned Unit Development Zoning

As outlined below, staff believes that the criteria for Planned Unit Development zoning can be met following small changes to reflect recommended conditions of approval.

MGO Section 28.07(6)(f) - PUD Criteria for Approval

a) Character and Intensity of Land Use- Staff believes that the proposed building, while taller and larger than many on the block, is compatible with other buildings in the area, and appropriate based on adopted and draft plans for the area, as well as the Downtown Design Zone standards.

The design of the building and the use of high quality exterior materials should provide for sustained aesthetic desirability. The use of brick similar to the Acacia building helps with the transition between the historic building and the contemporary architecture proposed. The storefront windows and entrance are well-oriented to West Lakelawn Place, which helps to break up the length of the building.

The Langdon Street area is one of the densest areas of the city, and the proposal would further increase the residential density at this location. However, the proximity to the UW Campus, State Street, other downtown activity centers, and transit makes it very easy for residents to rely on walking and bicycling, which mitigates some of the negative effects of high density. The proposed structured bicycle and moped parking areas should adequately serve the needs of residents, and along with the interior trash storage area, should improve the aesthetic of the property and set a positive precedent for future development in this area.

b) Economic Impact- The proposal should not significantly increase the cost of municipal services, and will significantly increase the assessed value of the subject property.

c) Preservation and Maintenance of Open Space- The proposal would replace a gravel surface parking lot with a multifamily building to include small landscaped areas as well as structured usable open space for tenants.

d) Implementation Schedule- Since this is a proposed PUD-SIP for one project, rather than one of many phases, this standard is less applicable.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the standards for zoning map amendments, the PUD criteria, and the design criteria for downtown design zones, staff supports the proposal with a few relatively minor recommended conditions of approval. On balance, staff believes that the replacement of a gravel parking lot with a well-designed multifamily apartment building is appropriate in this area. Staff note that the durable design, interior and exterior amenities on-site for tenants, and the management plan are integral to this proposal, which should result in a high-quality student housing option in the Langdon Street National Historic District near the UW Campus.

The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that standards for rezoning and Planned Unit Developments can be met, and forward this request to the August 2 meeting of the Common Council with a recommendation for **approval**, subject to input at the public hearing and conditions from reviewing agencies.

Recommendations and Proposed Conditions of Approval

Major/Non-Standard Conditions are shaded

Planning Division Recommendation

The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that standards for demolition approval and rezoning to PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan) can be met, and forward this request to the August 2 meeting of the Common Council with a recommendation for **approval**, subject to input at the public hearing and the following conditions from reviewing agencies.

Planning Division (Contact Heather Stouder, 266-5974)

1. Final plans submitted for staff review and approval shall address any conditions of approval recommended by the Urban Design Commission on July 20, 2011.
2. Prior to staff approval of the rezoning request, the applicant shall provide for staff review and approval a copy of tenant leases for both buildings which include an occupancy limit of one tenant per bedroom (not including double lodging rooms in the existing Acacia Building). The lease shall also include a clear indication that no long-term automobile parking is provided on the property, as well as a clear explanation of the intended use of all parking areas on the site.
3. Final plans submitted for staff review and approval shall include a pedestrian path with stairs to connect Lakelawn Place to the proposed patio on the north side of the building. The path may be provided either directly from the street or from the proposed loading area on this side of the building.
4. All bedrooms shall include either closets or furnished wardrobes for the storage of clothing.
5. The change in exterior materials from brick to concrete masonry units on the east side of the building shall be accompanied by a change in plane.
6. Final plans submitted for staff review and approval may replace the "green wall" element proposed on the lower level of the building surrounding the parking area with wooden louvers as has been submitted as an alternative by the applicant. If the "green wall" is included in final plans, the applicant shall include for review by staff additional information regarding its maintenance and appearance throughout the year.
7. Final plans submitted for staff review and approval shall include bicycle stalls at a ratio of at least one stall per bedroom (90 total stalls). A sufficient number of stalls shall be accessible by tenants of the Acacia building to maintain this ratio.
8. A revised management plan shall be provided for review and approval by staff. The Plan Commission shall retain continuing jurisdiction over the Management Plan, and may review it and require additional actions by the building owner to address problems or deficiencies determined to exist. The revised Management Plan shall incorporate the following items:
 - a) Contact information of the entity responsible for the management of the property.
 - b) Name and contact information for a private snow removal provider, if applicable.
 - c) More detail on recycling policies for both buildings and trash removal policies for the Acacia building, and the name and contact information for a private trash removal provider.
 - d) Clear policies regarding access to each building and part of the site by residents.
 - e) Clear policies and enforcement procedures regarding noise and other nuisances.
 - f) Clear policy indicating that moped parking is not allowed on the public terrace or sidewalk.

Zoning Administrator (Contact Matt Tucker, 266-4569)

9. Provide a minimum of twenty-four (24) bicycle parking stalls in a safe and convenient location on an impervious surface to be shown on the final plan. The racks shall be securely anchored to the ground or building to prevent the lockers or racks from being removed from the location. A bike-parking stall is two feet by six feet, with a six foot vertical clearance and a five-foot access aisle. A modification/waiver may be granted to accept the stacked racking system through this PUD approval.
10. Exterior lighting is being provided, and must comply with MGO Section 10.085, outdoor lighting standards.
11. In regard to the provision of off-street loading berths, the applicant is not providing a single 10' x 35' loading stall, and is therefore requesting a waiver/modification. The applicant is proposing two smaller loading spaces: an 8' x 16' loading space accessed from Lakelawn Place and a 9' by 18' small loading space accessed from West Lakelawn Place.
12. Please revise zoning text to incorporate the existing Acacia use/building into the PUD. The zoning text shall include dwelling unit mix, family definition, a statement about the lodging room use, and other common features required in a zoning text for similar developments.
13. Final plans submitted for staff review and approval shall include floor plans and elevations for the existing Acacia building.

City Engineering Division (Contact Janet Dailey, 261-9688)

14. The sump pump system shall be designed and sealed by a PE or Master Plumber and shall be designed to control/handle the 100-year design storm.
15. The parcel is part owner in 250 and or 249 West Lakelawn. There exists a public storm main in this area that requires repair. The applicant shall assist the City in obtaining the right to access this property to perform the required maintenance.
16. This property must connect to sanitary sewer draining to the southeast. May require public main extension and/or lateral relocated further south and east.
17. Submit a PDF of each floor plan to Engineering Mapping Lori Zenchenko (Lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com) so that a preliminary interior addressing plan can be developed. If there are any changes pertaining to the location of a unit, the deletion or addition of a unit, or to the location of the entrance into any unit, (before, during or after construction) the addresses may need to be changed. The interior address plan is subject to the review and approval of the Fire Marshal.
18. This project requires the owner to convey public street (including public storm sewer facilities) and public street lighting easements to the City of Madison. These easements will be administered by the City of Madison Office of Real Estate Services (Jeff Ekola). Reference Real Estate Project Nos. 9702, 9703 & 9704 on transmittal when submitting the required \$500 check (payable to City of Madison Treasurer) to the Office of Real Estate Services.
19. The Owner / Developer shall make the application for the proposed Vesta Condominium with the City of Madison Planning Division.
20. The City shall reconstruct West Lakelawn Place in 2012 including upgrading of City utilities. The applicant shall be assessed proportionately for their share of these improvements. Prior to approval, the owner shall execute a "waiver of notice" for these assessments. Additionally, the owner shall cooperate and coordinate their construction with the City project.
21. The construction of this building will require removal and replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter and possibly other parts of the City's infrastructure. The applicant shall enter into a City /

Developer agreement for the improvements required for this development. The applicant shall be required to provide deposits to cover City labor and materials and surety to cover the cost of construction. The applicant shall meet with the City Engineer to schedule the development of the plans and the agreement. The City Engineer will not sign off on this project without the agreement executed by the developer. The developer shall sign the Developer's Acknowledgement prior to the City Engineer signing off on this project (MGO 16.23(9)c).

22. The approval of this PUD does not include the approval of the changes to roadways, sidewalks or utilities. The applicant shall obtain separate approval by the Board of Public Works and the Common Council for the restoration of the public right of way including any changes requested by developer. The City Engineer shall complete the final plans for the restoration with input from the developer. The curb location, grades, tree locations, tree species, lighting modifications and other items required to facilitate the development or restore the right of way shall be reviewed by the City Engineer, City Traffic Engineer, and City Forester (MGO 16.23(9)(d)(6)).
23. The applicant shall provide the City Engineer with a survey indicating the grade of the existing sidewalk and street. The Applicant shall hire a Professional Engineer to set the grade of the building entrances adjacent to the public right of way. The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer the proposed grade of the building entrances. The City Engineer shall approve the grade of the entrances prior to signing off on this development (POLICY).
24. The applicant shall replace all sidewalk and curb and gutter which abuts the property which is damaged by the construction or any sidewalk and curb and gutter which the City Engineer determines needs to be replaced because it is not at a desirable grade regardless of whether the condition existed prior to beginning construction (POLICY).
25. All work in the public right-of-way shall be performed by a City licensed contractor (MGO 16.23(9)(c)5) and MGO 23.01).
26. All damage to the pavement on Lakelawn Place, adjacent to this development shall be restored in accordance with the City of Madison's Pavement Patching Criteria. For additional information please see the following link: <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/patchingCriteria.cfm> (POLICY).
27. For Commercial sites <1 acre in disturbance the City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce and WDNR. As this project is on a site with disturbance area less than one (1) acres, and contains a commercial building, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required (NOTIFICATION).
28. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, a digital CAD file (single file) to the Engineering Program Specialist in the Engineering Division (Lori Zenchenko). The digital CAD file shall be to scale and represent final construction. The single CAD file submittal can be either AutoCAD (dwg) Version 2001 or older, MicroStation (dgn) Version J or older, or Universal (dxf) format and contain only the following data, each on a separate layer name/level number:
 - a) Building Footprints
 - b) Internal Walkway Areas
 - c) Internal Site Parking Areas
 - d) Other Misc Impervious Areas (i.e. gravel, crushed stone, bituminous/asphalt, concrete, etc.)
 - e) Right-of-Way lines (public and private)
 - f) All Underlying Lot lines or parcel lines if unplatted
 - g) Lot numbers or the words "unplatted"
 - h) Lot/Plat dimensions
 - i) Street names

All other levels (contours, elevations, etc) are not to be included with this file submittal.

NOTE: Email file transmissions preferred addressing@cityofmadison.com. Include the site address in the subject line of this transmittal. Any changes or additions to the location of the building, sidewalks, parking/pavement during construction will require a new CAD file (POLICY and MGO 37.09(2) & 37.05(4)).

29. The applicant's utility contractor shall obtain a connection permit and excavation permit prior to commencing the storm sewer construction MGO 37.05(7). This permit application is available on line at: <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.

Traffic Engineering Division (Contact Bryan Walker, 267-8754)

30. The applicant shall provide a five foot (5') sidewalk on Lakelawn Place along the rear of the property and note this on submitted plans. The size and location of the short term parking area may be affected by this, and may need to be modified to allow for a 9'x16' stall with 2' of bumper overhang. Dimensions of the sidewalk and temporary parking area shall be noted on plans when submitted for approval.
31. The applicant shall be responsible for improvements to the corner of West Lakelawn Place and Lakelawn Place concerning sidewalk connections, curb and gutter, drainage improvements, and fire access.
32. When the applicant submits final plans for approval, the applicant shall show turning movements for a fire truck on West Lakelawn Place and Lakelawn Place.
33. City of Madison radio systems are microwave directional line of sight to remote towers citywide. The building elevation will need to be review by Traffic Engineer to accommodate the microwave sight and building. The applicant shall submit grade and elevations plans if the building exceeds four stories prior to sign-off to be reviewed and approved by Keith Lippert, (266-4767) Traffic Engineering Shop, 1120 Sayle Street. The applicant shall return one signed approved building elevation copy to the City of Madison Traffic Engineering office with final plans for sign off.
34. When the applicant submits final plans of one contiguous plan for approval, the applicant shall show the following: items in the terrace as existing (e.g., signs and street light poles), type of surfaces, existing property lines, addresses, showing all easements, all pavement markings, building placement, and stalls, adjacent driveway approaches to lots on either side and across the street, signage, percent of slope, vehicle routes, dimensions of radii, aisles, driveways, stalls including the two (2) feet overhang, and a scaled drawing at 1" = 20'.
35. When site plans are submitted for approval, the developer shall provide recorded copies of the joint driveway ingress/egress and easements.
36. The Developer shall post a deposit and reimburse the City for all costs associated with any modifications to Traffic Signals, Street Lighting, Signing and Pavement Marking, and conduit and handholes, including labor, engineering and materials for both temporary and permanent installations.
37. Public signing and marking related to the development may be required by the City Traffic Engineer for which the developer shall be financially responsible.

Water Utility (Contact Dennis Cawley, 261-9243)

38. This property is not in a Wellhead Protection District. All wells located on this property shall be abandoned if no valid well operation permit has been obtained from the Madison Water Utility.

Fire Department (Contact Bill Sullivan, 266-4420)

- 39. Provide fire apparatus access as required by IFC 503 2009 edition, MGO 34.503
- 40. The Fire Department does not object to this proposal provided the project meets all applicable fire codes and ordinances.

Parks Divison (Contact Kay Rutledge, 266-4714)

- 41. This development is within the Vilas-Brittingham park impact fee district (SI27). The developer shall pay \$30,349.62 in park dedication and development fees for a 14-unit apartment building.

Fees in lieu of dedication = (14 mf @ \$1,554) =	\$21,756.00
Park development fees = (14 mf @ \$613.83) =	\$ 8,593.62
Total fees =	\$30,349.62

- 42. The development must select a method for payment of park fees before signoff.
- 43. Approval of plans for this project does not include any approval to prune, remove or plant trees in the public right-of-way. Permission for such activities must be obtained from the City Forester, 266-4816.

Metro Transit (Contact Tim Sobota, 261-4289)

This agency did not submit comments for this request.